This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated October 3, 2007. Claims 1 to 20 are pending in the application, with Claim 20 having been newly-added herein. Claims 1, 8, 10, 17, 19 and 20 are the independent claims. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Without conceding the correctness of the rejection, Claim 19 has nonetheless been amended into independent form and to better recite in the preamble the statutory subject matter to which the claim is directed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 101 rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 5, 8, 14 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Each of the points noted in the Office Action have been attended to by amendment. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112 rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 7,216,292 (Snapper), and Claims 3, 6, 9, 12, 15 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 10\3(a) over Snapper in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,666, 502 (Capps). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

The present invention relates to holding, or not holding, login history of users. According to one aspect of the invention, user identification information for a plurality of users is stored in a storage unit, where the user identification information includes a first type of user (e.g., a default user) and a second type of user (e.g., a non-default user). A holding unit may also store history information for each of the plurality of users. On a login entry screen, a box may be included to allow a user to set information

whether to hold (leave) history information (see, e.g., Fig.10). When the user enters their user identification information (and optionally, a password), depending on the type of user corresponding to the entered user identification information, the history information may be held without requesting that the user set whether to hold the history information (e.g., automatically set to be held for default users), or the entry screen may allow the second type of user (e.g., non-default users) to set the information to hold the history.

Referring specifically to the claims, amended independent Claim 1 is directed to a device for performing a login process by using identification information of a user, comprising a storage unit configured to store identification information of each of a plurality of users including a first type of user and a second type of user, a setting unit configured to set information whether to hold a login history for each user of the plurality of users, a holding unit configured to hold the login history for each user in accordance with the information set by the setting unit, a displaying unit configured to display user identification information based on the login history held in the holding unit, an entering unit configured to enter user identification information of a user, and a controlling unit configured to cause the holding unit to hold the login history of the user corresponding to the entered user identification information without requesting the user to set information whether to hold the login history in a case where the entered user identification information corresponds to the first type of user, and to control to allow the user to set information whether to hold the login history in a case where the entered user identification information corresponds to the second type of user, wherein the entering unit can enter, in a case where any of the user identification information displayed on the displaying unit is selected, the user identification information.

Claims 10 and 19 are method and computer medium claims, respectively, that substantially correspond to Claim 1.

The applied art, alone or in any permissible combination, is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of Claims 1, 10 and 19, and in particular, is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the features of setting information whether to hold a login history for each user of the plurality of users, and causing the holding unit to hold the login history of the user corresponding to the entered user identification without requesting the user to set information whether to hold the login history in a case where the entered user identification information corresponds to a first type of user, and allowing the user to set information whether to hold the login history in a case where the entered user identification information corresponds to a second type of user.

Snapper is seen to teach that an internet browser suggests values that a user has previously entered when the user enters a value in a user name field. However, Snapper fails to teach or suggest setting information whether to hold a login history for each user of the plurality of users, and causing the holding unit to hold the login history of the user corresponding to the entered user identification without requesting the user to set information whether to hold the login history in a case where the entered user identification information corresponds to a first type of user, and allowing the user to set information whether to hold the login history in a case where the entered user identification information corresponds to a second type of user.

Capps is merely seen to teach setting a number (for example, five (5) names) for limiting the number of names that can be displayed on a history list. However, Capps also fails to teach or suggest setting information whether to hold a login history for

each user of the plurality of users, and causing the holding unit to hold the login history of the user corresponding to the entered user identification without requesting the user to set information whether to hold the login history in a case where the entered user identification information corresponds to a first type of user, and allowing the user to set information whether to hold the login history in a case where the entered user identification information corresponds to a second type of user.

Accordingly, Claims 1, 10 and 19 are not believed to be anticipated by Snapper, nor would they have been obvious over Snapper and Capps.

Amended independent Claim 8 is directed to an aspect of the invention that is related to Claim 1, but is more specifically directed to a data processing device displaying an entry screen for entering user identification information and password information, comprising a storage unit configured to store user identification information and password information for each of a plurality of users, the user identification information and the password information being associated with each other, a setting unit configured to set information whether to hold the user identification information, a display controlling unit configured to allow a display unit to display the user identification information that is set to be held by the setting unit on the entry screen, an entering unit configured to enter the user identification information and the password information on the entry screen, and a controlling unit configured to cause a holding unit to hold login history of the user corresponding to the entered user identification information without requesting the user to set information whether to hold the login history in a case where the entered user identification information corresponds to a first type of user, and controls to allow the user to set information whether to hold the login history in a case where the entered user

identification information corresponds to a second type of user, wherein the entering unit can enter the user identification information in a case where the user identification information displayed on the entry screen by the display controlling unit is selected.

Claims 17 and 20 are method and computer medium claims that substantially correspond to Claim 8.

The applied art is also not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of Claims 8, 17 and 20. Specifically, very much like the above-discussed aspect of Claims 1, 10 and 29, the applied art of Snapper and Capps is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of causing a holding unit to hold login history of a user corresponding to entered user identification information without requesting the user to set information whether to hold the login history in a case where the entered user identification information corresponds to a first type of user, and allowing the user to set information whether to hold the login history in a case where the entered user identification information corresponds to a second type of user.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, independent Claims 1, 8, 10, 17, 19 and 20, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to be allowable.

No other matters having been raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Edward Kmett/

_____

Edward A. Kmett
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 1887380v1